

100-1-30011

SEP 11 1998

RECEIVED

8-29-1998

Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street NW
Room 222
Washington DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Sirs:

In regards to the following:

"In the matter of 1998 Biennial
Regulatory Review - Amendment of
PART 97 of the Commission's
Amateur Service Rules
FCC WT DOCKET 98-143"

I request the pleasure of
providing to you my point of view
concerning the above docket
and the proposed changes therein

I thank you for allowing
me to do so. It's a privilege to do so.

with regards

Kenneth W. Schultz

KENNETH W. SCHULTZ
AMATEUR RADIO OPERATOR

"KBS4JY"

Remarks Attached

Accompanying:
6 Copies

OTY

PAGE 1 of 4

COMM-FROOM

SEP 11 1999 FCC WT DOCKET 98-143

RECEIVED

1 - With regards to the FCC proposal for the reduction of the number of license classes from the present 6 classes, down too 4 classes: we do not need all these classes to begin with, only a beginners class - so that they can learn about operating a amateur radio and then only a "General class" for all privileges of operating. The other classes are not needed they only increase the management by the FCC.

2 - With regards to the proposal before you about the code speed I am for dropping the code requirement all together, but by treaty we must have a code requirement for present, so 5wpm is fine. The written exams should be "bumped" up in theory to compensate for dropping the code requirement to 5wpm.

FCC WT DOCKET 98-143

SEP 11 1998

RECEIVED

- 3 - In regards to the FCC proposal to administering the General Class Code & Theory Exams
I agree with the FCC
- 4 - In regards to the FCC proposal eliminating the separate RACES licensing:
I agree with the FCC
- 5 - In regards to the FCC urgency about "enforcement issues"
I would like to see the FCC put some real "teeth" into this area. The deliberate "jamming" of other stations and interference must be stopped, even if it requires the removal of a license and/or a healthy fine

SEP 11 1968

RECEIVED FCC WT Scket 98-143

6 - Also I request the FCC review the issuance of call signs to operators not located in the "Call Area" of the operation.

It is my feeling that no operator should be allowed to use a call sign which does not reflect the area of operation of the station. Specially issued call signs should also reflect the area they are to be used in.

7 - Also with regards to the FCC's PRO-1:

Thank you very much for this ruling. It's a help we sorely need.

8 - With regards as to my background regarding my answers:

I served in the US NAVY as a Communication Technician - as such I could copy code at over 20 WPM. I have been a Amateur Operator from 1992 to the present - holding Advanced class and the call sign of KB54JY.

Thank You

page 4 of 4